

# Is Shared Leadership An Oxymoron?

**A**ccording to the dictionary: *to share* means “to join with others in doing or experiencing something” while *leadership* is “the capacity to lead; to guide on a way especially by going in advance.”

Thus the question is whether or not archaeological resource management leadership can be achieved by sharing responsibilities and actions. The hypothesis put forward is that, in this day and age, it may be the only way to long-lasting success. Internally within Parks Canada, at the departmental level, between different levels of government, and with other stakeholders such as private stewards of cultural properties, interest groups like Save Ontario Ships and professional associations such as the Canadian Archaeological Association (CAA), there already exist numerous examples of collaboration to advance, advocate and promote the objectives of archaeological resource management.

Current fiscal and political reality has had widespread direct and indirect impacts. Whether federal or provincial or territorial civil servants, academics or students, private consultants or public employees, all have been touched.

Globally, all levels of government have been undergoing significant and continuous budget reductions over the past several years. Program and service offerings once considered “untouchable” and for the public good have been severely curtailed or eliminated. The need to sustain some minimal level of professional capability, focus on primary mandate, and eliminate duplication has led to many of the current efforts to harmonize services across jurisdictional boundaries.

At the federal level in Canada, the government’s recent focus was to reaffirm those fundamental responsibilities which are essential to achieving its mandate, and in the most cost effective means possible. With respect to archaeology, this resulted in a confirmation that archaeological resource management was an appropriate activity to meet federal land management and cultural resource management responsibilities. As a result, the Federal Archaeology Office (FAO) was established in 1995 within Parks Canada, a program in the Department of Canadian Heritage. However, the FAO is not new. It is an integration, rational-

ization and streamlining of both the organization and responsibilities of Parks Canada’s former Archaeological Services Branch, and the former Department of Communication’s Directorate of Archaeological Resource Management (DARM). The result, taking into account an overall 30% budget reduction, is a downsized and restructured organization, and the elimination of the popular *Access to Archaeology* grant program.

FAO merged responsibilities can be summarized as:

- the provision of advice to federal land managers in the protection of archaeological resources;
- the implementation of various commitments made in the 1990 Cabinet approved Archaeological Heritage Policy Framework,<sup>1</sup> which articulated the government’s intentions with respect to the protection and management of archaeological resources, and
- the provision of policy and operational support to meet Parks Canada’s archaeology requirements.

So, how does the concept of shared leadership apply from this federal viewpoint?

## *Within Parks Canada*

Internally, within the Parks organization, there is a recognition that only certain responsibilities can and should be met by the FAO in Ottawa. They generally centre around national policy and legislative matters, and in specialty services such as underwater archaeology or material culture research that find their home there. Although the merger formed an organizational unit in Ottawa, the expanded mandate relies upon Parks’ regional archaeology capability to support their colleagues in other departments in meeting their land management responsibilities. This, to date, has included providing technical advice and guidance to departments such as National Defence, and Indian and Northern Affairs, primarily as it relates to their responsibilities in meeting the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (CEAA) and in the negotiation of land claim settlements. Prior to the merger between DARM and Archaeological Services, the main focus of Parks’ professional staff was inward, to address national park and national historic site specific issues, a workload which, by itself, remains overwhelming. However,

the merger has expanded the horizon of responsibilities with minimal additional resources. The Department of Canadian Heritage's purpose is to ensure that the government's obligation for archaeological resource protection and management are met. Parks is collectively working together to produce the tools and guidelines essential to meet this obligation in a cost effective manner. The regions are assuming even more significant roles and demonstrating their capacity for shared leadership.

#### *With Other Federal Departments*

Environment Canada:

The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, situated within Environment Canada, is responsible for administering the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*.<sup>2</sup> It has chosen to share responsibilities and leadership by designating some federal government departments as experts for certain matters. The Department of Canadian Heritage, as represented by Parks Canada, is considered by the Agency as the expert department for natural and cultural heritage, and as such, provides both the Agency and colleague departments advice and guidance on how to ensure projects under the scrutiny of CEAA take these resource concerns into consideration.

Active support of the Agency has allowed Parks Canada to prepare reference guides for environmental assessment practitioners. An example is the recently Agency publication, *Assessing Environmental Effects on Physical and Cultural Heritage Resources*.<sup>3</sup> This is one of several guides published by the Agency as supporting documentation for the Act. These, and other guidelines and tools Parks develops to meet internal policy requirements for impact assessment which go beyond those stipulated in CEA regulations, will be readily available to all interested parties.

Transport Canada:

Attempts at shared leadership can also be applied to Canadian Heritage's recent unsuccessful efforts to secure some level of protection for heritage wreck. While not a perfect solution or as all-encompassing as separate legislative efforts made in the early '90s, the proposal piggy backed on the initiative of Transport Canada to update the *Canada Shipping Act (CSA)* which has jurisdiction over all navigable waters and salvage. The intent of the enabling legislation, only triggered by agreement with provinces, territories or other federal government departments, was to remove potential heritage wreck from the current salvage provisions in the CSA and place them into a protective regime.

Unfortunately, the proposal generated some jurisdictional concerns which could not be overcome within the legislative timetable. It did, how-

ever, highlight a continued interest, by all parties, to work together in finding a mutually acceptable protective regime for heritage wreck. The Department is committed to develop other, hopefully more successful, strategies to meet the protective requirements identified.

Other stakeholders:

#### *Aboriginal groups*

Parks Canada's vision to support an expanded national historic sites system and promote cultural resource management is focused on partnership. A collective sense of responsibility and stewardship for the care and protection of resources is fundamental. Parks is particularly committed to the improved representation of Aboriginal history in partnerships with Aboriginal peoples. Consultations with a wide variety of Aboriginal groups in each region of the country is underway to ensure their support and participation in initiatives to commemorate their heritage, a priority of the National Historic Sites System Plan and the current government.

#### *Sport Diving Clubs*

The Underwater Archaeology Section of the FAO is no stranger to the collective approach. Last year marked the 30th anniversary of the formation of this internationally recognized group. With a solid research reputation, the past few years have seen increasing collaborative efforts. It started in 1995 to offer Nautical Archaeology Society (NAS) courses to interested and qualified groups to ensure the maintenance of archaeological standards with partnership arrangements. This education program developed in Great Britain is recognized internationally as the standard in underwater avocational training.

Recognizing the necessity of stakeholder participation, the group is involving more and more local volunteer sport divers in their work. Projects in Banff and Prince Edward Island National Parks have had great success, but the off-shoot of the work done on the French wreck *Corossol* in Sept-Îles, Quebec, probably best illustrates the results that partnerships with sport divers can render. Following this project in which local divers played an important role, other divers from the North Shore of Quebec informed Parks Canada of additional known wreck sites. One located between Baie Comeau and Sept Îles, at l'Anse aux Bouleaux, has turned out to be a significant find.

Due to unprecedented storm activity in the area in the past two years, the once unknown wreck was churned out of its 300 year resting place and was now subject to constant battering by the wave action in the bay it was located. Emergency site stabilization work and examination of initially found artifacts has lead to the eventual determination that this wreck is one of

the ships of Sir William Phips' failed expedition from the Colony of Massachusetts against Québec in 1690. Once primarily interested in salvage, the local sport divers formed an organization (Groupe de préservation des vestiges subaquatiques de Manicouagan) for the protection of submerged cultural resources in their area. They have actively and enthusiastically participated in the site work which commenced in the summer of 1995 and was expanded in 1996. Currently under negotiation is a unique collaboration of three levels of government (federal, provincial and municipal) and a local sport diving club focussed towards the protection and presentation of this important site and its artifacts.

#### *Succession Planning*

The Material Culture Research staff at FAO operates as a centre of expertise in the material culture of the historic period. This unit's work has traditionally supported internal operational requirements of Parks Canada's archaeological, curatorial and site interpretation programs.

Future priorities for this group will shift into two areas: publishing and training. Their work is already well known through publications such as: *Parks Canada Glass Glossary*, *Trade Ornament Usage Among the Native Peoples of Canada*, *The Wheat Pattern*, and *Lighting Devices in the National Reference Collection*, and specialized training courses offered through venues such as Council for Northeast Historical Archaeology (CNEHA) workshops. With downsizing and the anticipated increasing use of consultants and volunteers, it is even more important for the material culture researchers to pass on their specialized and unique knowledge.

To capitalize on existing research expertise FAO plans include material culture readers. These will be brief guides to dating, identifying and describing such diverse artifact groups as 19th-century glass tableware and domestic electrical artifacts. Also planned are larger, more detailed studies, such as a guide to 17th- to 20th-century table cutlery.

Potential partnerships with universities will be explored to assist in training students in material culture. While every province in Canada has one or more degree programs in archaeology, there are very limited opportunities to study historical archaeology. The collective unique knowledge embodied in the Material research group and the vast Park Canada collections can make significant contributions.

#### *Conclusion*

What has been reviewed are diverse approaches being pursued by the Federal Archaeology Office, Parks Canada, in a spectrum of archaeological matters to share federal leader-

ship in a variety of important areas of legislation, management, knowledge, and protection. The one unknown which may significantly affect the manner in which these responsibilities are delivered is the creation of the Parks Canada Agency.

Parks Canada has developed a business plan approach to meet its future challenges. It is the mechanism to fulfill obligations to expand both the National Parks and National Historic Sites systems, while ensuring protection and presentation of current parks and sites, service to clients, and wise and efficient use of public funds. Conceptualized two years ago, the business plan approach has no doubt supported the government's decision to create a Parks Canada Agency within the Department, announced in the budget speech in February 1995. Not intended to either privatize or commercialize the national treasures, the Agency status will undoubtedly provide a greater degree of organizational, financial, and administrative autonomy, essential if the ambitious Business Plan goals are to be achieved. Despite the desire to be "nimble," Parks is fully committed to fulfilling its mandate to protect and present places which are significant examples of Canada's cultural and natural heritage. Time will tell, as the department prepares for the creation of the agency, how the impetus toward shared leadership in achieving this mandate will not only be maintained, but expanded.

#### **Notes**

- <sup>1</sup> Canada. Department of Canadian Heritage, *Archaeological Heritage Policy Framework*, Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1990, Cat. No. Co22-93/1990, ISBN 0-662-57510-5.
- <sup>2</sup> *Statutes of Canada* 1992, Chapter 37, Bill C-13, Assented to 23rd June 1992.
- <sup>3</sup> Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, *Reference Guide on Physical and Cultural Heritage Resources*, April 1996, Minister of Supply and Services Canada 1996, ISBN 0-662-24599-

---

*Susan Hum-Hartley is Acting Director of the Federal Archaeology Office in the National Historic Sites Directorate of Parks Canada in Ottawa.*

This paper was presented at the Canadian Archaeological Association conference, May 1996, Halifax, N.S.